DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 360 887 HE 026 619

AUTHOR Algee, Alan; Bowers, Winefred
TITLE A Comparison of Learning Styles between Asian and American Seminary Students. Research Methodology.
PUB DATE Jul 93
NOTE 34p.; Ed.D. Practicum Report, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age; *Church Related Colleges; *Cognitive Style; Comparative Analysis; Comparative Education; *Cultural Differences; Educational Background; Foreign Countries; *Graduate Students; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Sex Differences; Theological Education
IDENTIFIERS *Asian Students; Learning Style Inventory; *Theology Students

ABSTRACT

This study examined learning style differences between Asian and American seminary students at two post-baccalaureate, Assembly of God seminaries. The study randomly selected 100 students from the Asia Pacific Theological Seminary (APTS) in Baguio, Philippines and the Assembly of God Theological Seminary (AGTS) in the United States of whom 24 from each institution responded. Students revealed their learning styles through the Kolb Learning Style Inventory which classifies learners as divergers, assimilators, convergers, and accommodators. The sample population also supplied information on sex, age, years of college, and nationality in order to examine whether these variables were related to learning style variations. Results of the study, though limited due to low response rate and not statistically significant, indicated that American and Asian seminary students did vary somewhat in their predominate styles of learning. Other variables also appeared related to Kolb's four styles of learning. Seminary professors can possible expect students in an Asian seminary to be more often divergers while students in an American seminary are more often assimilators. Variations due to sex, age, and years in college occur in both locations. Appendixes contain copies of correspondence and a questionnaire. Contains 31 references. (JB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

HE

# A COMPARISON OF LEARNING STYLES BETWEEN ASIAN AND AMERICAN SEMINARY STUDENTS

Research Methodology

ED 360 887

Alan Algee

Eurasia Education Service

Winefred Bowers

Springfield, Missiouri

A Practicum Report presented to Nova University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

Nova University

July, 1993

HE 026 619

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ALAN ALGEE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## ABSTRACT

This practicum was concerned with the difference in learning styles found among students of an American seminary and an Asian seminary. The problem was the difficulty professors often have when they transfer from an American seminary to an Asian one. Three questions were asked. First, what is the predominate learning style among students at APTS and AGTS? Second, what is the difference, if any, in the learning style between Asian and American seminary students? Third, is there a relationship between learning styles and other independent variables such as gender, age, nationality, and years of education among these students?

Fifty students were randomly chosen from each seminary to reveal their learning style through the Kolb Learning Style Inventory. The sample population was also asked to reveal their sex, age, years of college, and nationality in order to see if these variables were related to variation in learning styles.

American and Asian seminary students did vary in their predominate style of learning. The other variables, sex, age, and years of college also appeared to have had some relationship to Kolb's four styles of learning. The results of the study are limited due to the less than minimal response required to assure 95% probability. The chi-square and ANOVA were computed to determine significance at the .05 level. No variable under study was statistically significant.

Seminary professors can possibly expect students in an Asian seminary to be more often divergers while students in an American seminary are more often assimilators. Professors in both locations can also expect some variation according to sex, age, and years in college.

The study should be repeated with more care given to sample size and with matching the samples for secondary variables. The KLSI should be used at both seminaries on an on-going basis in order to reveal valuable information about the unique learning styles found among the various student populations and for the placement of professors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES ..... 5

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION ..... 6

Background and Significance ..... 6

Research Questions ..... 7

Research Hypotheses ..... 8

Definitions ..... 8

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ..... 10

3. METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES ..... 13

Data Collection ..... 13

Data Analysis ..... 15

Limitations ..... 16

Assumptions ..... 16

4. RESULTS ..... 17

5. DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS,

AND RECOMMENDATIONS ..... 24

Discussion ..... 24

Conclusion ..... 25

Implications ..... 25

Recommendations ..... 26

REFERENCES ..... 27

APPENDIXES ..... 30

A. Letter of Authorization ..... 32

B. Questionnaire to Accompany the KLSI ..... 35

C. Cover Letter to the KLSI and Questionnaire ..... 36

## LIST OF TABLES

Page

1. Survey Response ..... 17
2. Profile Of Respondents ..... 18
3. Comparison Of Learning Style Quadrants By Seminary, Sex, Age Group, and Years Of College ..... 20
4. Comparison Of Mean LSI Scores By Seminary, Sex, Age Group,, and Years Of College ..... 22

# Chapter 1

# INTRODUCTION

## Background and Significance

American professors and administrators at Asia Pacific Theological Seminary (APTS), Baguio, Philippines, sometimes have difficulty in adjusting for the difference in classroom dynamics when transferring from an American seminary to an Asian one. Field reports indicate some frustration and protracted adjustment. Discussions among these practitioners have lead to the preliminary conclusion that Asian learning style probably contrasts in some way with that of American seminary students from whom these teachers have derived their past teaching experience. Eurasia Educational Service (EES), a consulting agency, needs to identify any predominate learning styles demonstrated by American and Asian seminary students in order to help explain to the professors and administrators the reason for finding different classroom dynamics in the Philippines.

The purpose of this practicum is to (a) identify the predominate learning styles among students at APTS (Philippines) and the Assembly of God Theological Seminary (AGTS) in the USA; (b) to determine if the learning styles of Asian and American seminary students are significantly different; and (c) to assess the relationship between learning styles and other independent variables, such as sex, age group, Asian nationality, and years of education.

Eurasia Education Service represents the Division of Foreign Missions of the Assemblies of God in matters of ministerial training in Eurasia. The AGTS (Missouri) and APTS each serve the clientele of their continent as the primary center for seminary level (post graduate) training for ministry within the

Assemblies of God. The author is an educational consultant with EES and has been asked to conduct a research project into the matter of learning styles as demonstrated by the two constituencies (Asian and American) which often share American personnel (see Appendix A). The conclusions will be used to discuss with existing and future staff possible reasons for frustration and how to best approach a teaching event at APTS.

This practicum is clearly related to topics examined in the Research Methodology seminar. The emphasis in the seminar was on the appropriate use of educational research techniques and procedures in order to treat problems, answer questions, or make decisions. All three of these components lie behind the present study and form the basis of the research questions. The procedures follow research protocol as presented in the text and lecture. Matthews (1991) concluded that research into the link between learning style and cultural/ethnic groups remains weak. Studies can be found which do include research into gender, age, education, and experience, but the most recent studies usually treat them as only secondary variables (Choi, 1989; Titus, 1990; Matthews, 1991; Missouri University, 1986). While Pun (1990) concluded that students in East Asia prefer teacher centered processes over action learner approaches, it still remains undocumented as to whether or not Asian seminary students tend to demonstrate a learning style different from their American counterparts.

## Research Questions

The questions for this research study are: 1) what is the predominate learning style among students at APTS and AGTS; 2) what is the difference, if

any, in the learning style between Asian and American seminary students; and 3) is there a relationship between learning styles and other independent variables such as gender, age, nationality, and years of education among these students?

## Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses for this study are: 1) Students as APTS and AGTS have separate predominate learning styles; 2) students at APTS and AGTS have unique positions in cognitive quadrants; 3) learning styles vary according to gender, age, nationality, and years of education.

## Definitions

Seminary refers to a post-baccalaureate degree program for those preparing for ministry. The two seminaries of this study are parallel in terms of curriculum, academic standards, admission requirements, and Assemblies of God doctrine. They both draw students who want to prepare for some level of ministry. The US Seminary is located in Springfield, MO, and serves graduate students from across the US. The Asian seminary is located in Baguio, Philippines, and serves graduate students found in eastern Asia (Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Taiwanese, Korean, Laotian, and Vietnamese).

In this study, the term learning style refers to one's consistent use of a cognitive strategies as revealed by the KLSI. The diverger prefers reflective and concrete learning modes. The assimilator tends to follow abstract and reflective learning approaches. The converger looks to abstract and active learning modes. The accomodators rely on concrete experience and active experimentation. Asian

refers to those found in eastern Asia (Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Taiwanese, Korean, Laotian, and Vietnamese) while American refers to those who are not identified as a foreigner on the supplementary questionnaire. Predominate learning style means that style which is most often represented among the four under study.

# Chapter 2

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The recent literature covering learning style is relatively abundant. Clearly there are sweeping implications for practitioners if learners truly respond to an instructional event based upon cognitive orientation. The first challenge in examining these issues is to conceptualize the notion of "learning style". The second is to accurately find the variables which are related to the different styles of learning. The third is to accurately apply our understanding of learning style to actual situations.

The existence of unique styles of learning is well established (Boham, 1989; DeBello, 1989; Missouri University, 1986; Partridge, 1989; Reiff, 1992). The more prominent ways in which those styles are described depends on the theorist or researcher. Dunn (1978) believes that there were four broad categories to describe relevant conditions which affected one's learning experience. Entwistle (1979) prefers to measure four cognitive skills such as comprehension and organization in order to compile a profile of one's learning style. Similarly, Kolb (1985) describes four types of cognitive approaches linked to processing of one's learning experiences. Others, such as Hunt (1977), examine affective styles. Still others, such as Myers (1976) steep their description into the analytical traditions which resort to complex profiles or "personality types". While learning style can certainly be assessed, choosing a way to measure it can be problematic (Fellenz, 1989; Karrer, 1988) because the construct is not tightly defined and therefore conclusive validity can be difficult to establish.

While scientific inquiry settles the main question as to the existence of learning style, the question becomes more difficult when one asks about the particular variables behind different learning modalities. The number of variables that might be suspicious of having some link to learning styles are nearly unlimited. Germane to the present study are those variables which might be linked to the diversity occurring among seminary students. It has been well established that students of a particular major or career path frequently show a shared learning style (Choi, 1989; Heitmeyer & Thomas, 1990; Matthews, 1992). Other groupings, such as ethnic and cultural, occasionally demonstrate a contrast in learning style (Ewing & Yong, 1992; Ross, 1990) but the research in this area is not plentiful (Matthews, 1991). More particular variables such as sex, age, education, and experience also seem to be linked to learning styles (Choi, 1989; Titus, 1990; Matthews, 1991; Missouri University, 1986).

Since the occurrence of learning style is well documented and since students are known to be carriers of those variables which represent different learning styles, it becomes important to know if these variations are significant enough to warrant attention, if not adjustment, as instructional delivery is considered. Rhodes and Swish (1991) observe that a mismatch between an ethnic group of a predominate learning style with a teacher using a different teaching style can result in serious frustration. Moreover, recent studies contain conclusions that the effectiveness of teaching may be highly dependent on learning style (Bodi, 1990; Bonham, 1989; Cordell, 1991; Dillie & Mezack, 1991; Hudak & Anderson, 1990; Reiff, 1992; Sims & Sims, 1991).

When the instruction adjusts for students' style as revealed by the Kolb Learning Style Inventory, learning seems to improve (Ast, 1989; Partridge, 1989; Sangster & Shulman, 1988). The KLSI has been especially helpful in describing variations among participants in training situations, research situations, and foreign situations (DeBello, 1989; Karrer, 1988; Katz, 1988; Rule & Grippin, 1988). Of special concern to the author was the difference, if any, between Asian and American seminary students. While Pun (1990) concludes that students in East Asia prefer teacher centered processes over action learner approaches, it still remains undocumented as to whether or not Asian seminary students tend to demonstrate a learning style different from their American counterparts.

The inquiry into learning style becomes very useful once it is understood how to respond to the variations. Once these variations are known in terms of the Kolb Learning Style Inventory, American professor's and administrators at APTS can consider adjusting instruction accordingly.

# Chapter 3

## METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

### Data Collection

The problem-solving methodology used in this study was research. The Academic Deans at APTS and AGTS were contacted by phone and letter for official approval to conduct the study and to obtain a list of all full-time students attending their seminary. Each student's name was posted on an Excel spreadsheet and assigned a number which was then randomized by Excel's formula for statistical randomization. From each seminary, the first 50 students on the randomized list were issued the The Kolb Learning Style Inventory (1985) and a supplementary questionnaire (see Appendix B).

you might mention that. both Academic deans wanted to see the results

In the case of AGTS, the instruments were sent to the studen class mail along with a cover letter (see Appendix C) and a stamped, addressed, envelope. At APTS, the Academic Dean preferred to pe distribute the instrument and the cover letter to the selected students. He further preferred to collect the instruments and mail them from the Philippines in one package.

The cover letter was written on EES official stationary, cited the support from the Academic Dean, explained the purpose of the study, and invited the subjects to provide their name only if they wish to have an evaluation of their learning style returned. It was hoped that students might be more motivated to return the instrument if they had an opportunity to discover something useful to their academic career (i.e. their unique learning style).

## Data Analysis

The null hypotheses under study were: 1) there is no significant difference in the predominate learning styles among students at AGTS and APTS; 2) there is no significant difference between learning styles and age, gender, nationality, nor years of college.

The conventional $p = .05$ level of significance was chosen since the study was done without replication. A more course screen would increase the risk of type II errors which, in the researcher's judgment, was not a wise utility. The region of rejected further followed all other comparable research studies of Kolb's theory of learning style.

The scores from the KLSI were sorted according the independent variables (seminary, nationality, age, gender, and years of college) and analyzed using a chi-square and a single-factor ANOVA. Both statistical tools were used to test both null hypotheses. Since all scores were placed in one of four quadrants, and since the number of members for each quadrant could be anticipated, the chi-square was appropriate in determining if the difference between the expected versus the actual frequencies was meaningful. The single-factor ANOVA provided a much more powerful way to see if the difference among the means of dependent variables was statistically significant at the $p = .05$ level of confidence. The means were subject to variation between the groups and within the groups. This variation was appropriately processed by the ANOVA through its observed F value in comparison to its critical F value.

## Limitations

The dependent variables under study are limited to the gradients on the KLSI, which are strictly cognitive, and yield relative strength in terms of four styles: accommodator, diverger, converger, and assimilator. No conclusions about adaptations in one's learning style are intended. Any relationships between the various teaching styles and their effectiveness at either location were not within the scope of the study.

The conclusions may not be valid at all other ethnic or regional situations except to suspect that ethnic or regional variations may be related to variations in learning styles among graduate students. External validity is limited to the parameters set in the title of this practicum and for the year of the study.

## Assumptions

The underlying assumptions include a belief that people have a learning style which can be described after use of the KLSI, and that the subjects responded honestly to the instrument. It is further assumed that the populations at each seminary bear a close similarity to the geographical area they serve and that any significant difference in predominate learning style was detectable by the instrument. Microsoft Excel is assumed to correctly execute all of the statistical functions including randomization and mathematical treatment. The researcher is assumed to have posted the scores exactly as they appeared on the score sheets and that the subjects were who they claimed to be. The author spent $237.23 for the project and it is assumed that the amount spent was sufficient and appropriate.

# Chapter 4

## RESULTS

Of 100 surveys distributed, 48 were returned and accepted. Of those returned, 24 (48%) were from AGTS and 24 (48%) were from APTS (table 1). The major characteristics of the respondents were evenly distributed between seminaries and sufficiently distributed across sex, age, and years of college. The respondents were unevenly distributed across nationality. (table 2).

Table 1

Survey Response

| | Number Distributed | Number Returned | Number Completed |
|---|---|---|---|
| AGTS | 50 (50%) | 24 (48%) | 24 (48%) |
| APTS | 50 (50%) | 24 (48%) | 24 (48%) |
| Total | 100 (100%) | 48 (48%) | 48 (48%) |

Table 2

Profile Of Respondents

| | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Seminary | | |
| American | 24 | 50% |
| Asian | 24 | 50% |
| Sex | | |
| Male | 36 | 75% |
| Female | 12 | 25% |
| Age group | | |
| 20-23 | 2 | 4% |
| 24-27 | 14 | 29% |
| 28-31 | 12 | 25% |
| 32-35 | 9 | 19% |
| 36-39 | 5 | 10% |
| 39 &39+ | 6 | 13% |
| Years in College | | |
| Four | 11 | 23% |
| Five | 12 | 25% |
| Six | 17 | 35% |
| Seven & 7+ | 8 | 17% |
| Nationality | | |
| United States | 25 | 52% |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Australian | 2 | 4% |
| Filipino | 10 | 21% |
| Korean | 4 | 8% |
| Chinese | 2 | 4% |
| India | 1 | 2% |
| Singapore | 2 | 4% |
| Malaysian | 2 | 4% |

The first research question was, "what is the predominate learning style among students at APTS and AGTS?" Table 3 shows that at APTS the highest percentage were divergers (46%) while at AGTS the highest percentage were assimilators (54%). The second research question was "what is the difference, if any, in the learning styles between Asian and American seminary students?" Table 3 shows the percentage of the students at each seminary who use the four learning styles. The third research question asked if "there is a relationship between learning styles and other independent variables such as gender, age, nationality, and years of education among these students?" Table 3 shows that females were more often assimilators while males were more often divergers. The relationship between age and years in college are also shown on table 3. The data for nationality was not computed since the results would be so inconclusive due to the distribution (see Table 2).

Table 3

Comparison Of Learning Style Quadrants By Sex, Age Group, Years Of College, and Seminary

| | N | % | Diverger | Accomodator | Assimilator | Converger |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seminary | | | | | | |
| AGTS | 24 | (50%) | 4 (17%) | 3 (13%) | 13 (54%) | 4 (17%) |
| APTS | 24 | (50%) | 11 (46%) | 0 (0%) | 9 (38%) | 4 (17%) |
| Chi-square = 6.99; 3 d.f. | | | | | | |
| Sex | | | | | | |
| Male | 36 | (75%) | 10 (28%) | 3 (8%) | 18 (50%) | 5 (14%) |
| Female | 12 | (25%) | 5 (42%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (33%) | 3 (25%) |
| Chi-square = 2.77; 3 d.f. | | | | | | |
| Age group | | | | | | |
| 20-23 | 2 | (4%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) | 1 (50%) | 0 (0%) |
| 24-27 | 14 | (29%) | 4 (29%) | 0 (0%) | 8 (57%) | 2 (14%) |
| 28-31 | 12 | (25%) | 3 (25%) | 2 (17%) | 5 (42%) | 2 (17%) |
| 32-35 | 9 | (19%) | 5 (56%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (33%) | 1 (11%) |
| 36-39 | 5 | (10%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 1 (20%) | 2 (40%) |
| 39 &39+ | 6 | (13%) | 1 (17%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (67%) | 1 (17%) |
| Chi-square = 12.48; 15 d.f. | | | | | | |
| Years in College | | | | | | |
| Four | 11 | (23%) | 6 (55%) | 0 (0%) | 3 (27%) | 2 (18%) |
| Five | 12 | (25%) | 3 (25%) | 2 (17%) | 5 (42%) | 2 (17%) |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Six | 17 (35%) | 3 (18%) | 1 (6%) | 10 (59%) | 3 (18%) |
| Seven + | 8 (17%) | 3 (38%) | 0 (0%) | 4 (50%) | 1 (13%) |

Chi-square = 8.08; 9 d.f.

Chi-square = 7.82 (critical); degrees of freedom = 3; $p < .05$

Chi-square = 16.92 (critical); degrees of freedom = 9; $p < .05$

Chi-square = 25 (critical); degrees of freedom = 15; $p < .05$

* Statistically significant

The first null hypothesis of this study was that "there is no significant difference in the predominate learning styles among students at AGTS and APTS" and the second null hypothesis was that "there is no significant difference between learning styles and age, gender, nationality, nor years of college". Both hypotheses must be accepted based on the chi-square values of Table 3 and the ANOVAs of Table 4.

Table 4

Comparison Of Mean LSI Scores By Sex, Age Group, Years Of College, and Seminary

| | N | % | AE | CE | RO | AC | AE-RO | AC-CE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Seminary | | | | | | | | |
| US | 24 | 50% | 31 | 24 | 34 | 32 | -2.42 | 8.17 |
| Asian | 24 | 50% | 30 | 26 | 33 | 32 | -2.67 | 6.50 |
| F (observed) | | | 0.37 | 0.95 | 0.30 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.21 |
| F = 4.05 (critical) | | | | | | | | |
| Sex | | | | | | | | |
| Male | 36 | 75% | 31 | 25 | 32 | 32 | -1 | 7 |
| Female | 12 | 25% | 28 | 24 | 36 | 32 | -9 | 9 |
| F (observed) | | | 1.99 | 0.90 | 3.88 | 0.90 | 3.91 | 0.00 |
| F = 4.05 (critical) | | | | | | | | |
| Age group | | | | | | | | |
| 20-23 | 2 | 4% | 31 | 28 | 32 | 30 | -2 | 2 |
| 24-27 | 14 | 29% | 28 | 23 | 35 | 34 | -7 | 11 |
| 28-31 | 12 | 25% | 33 | 25 | 30 | 32 | 3 | 7 |
| 32-35 | 9 | 19% | 30 | 26 | 34 | 29 | -4 | 3 |
| 36-39 | 5 | 10% | 32 | 25 | 35 | 28 | -2 | 3 |
| 40+ | 6 | 13% | 30 | 24 | 32 | 35 | -2 | 11 |
| F (observed) | | | 0.56 | 0.39 | 1.33 | 0.83 | 1.08 | 0.80 |
| F = 2.43 (critical) | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Years in College | | | | | | | | |
| Four | 11 | 23% | 31 | 28 | 32 | 29 | 0.91 | 1.64 |
| Five | 12 | 25% | 32 | 25 | 33 | 30 | 1.00 | 4.67 |
| Six | 17 | 35% | 29 | 23 | 33 | 35 | 3.41 | 12.40 |
| Seven + | 8 | 17% | 30 | 23 | 35 | 32 | 5.25 | 8.50 |
| F observed) | | | 0.37 | 1.20 | 0.45 | 2.02 | 0.32 | 1.95 |
| F = 2.82 (critical) | | | | | | | | |

$p < .05$

*Statistically significant

# Chapter 5

# DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

## Discussion

The students involved in this study did show a variation in learning style for all of the variables for which computations were made. American students had the highest number of assimilators (54%) while Asian students had the highest number of divergers (46%). The style with the highest number of males was assimilator (50%) while the highest number of females was diverger (42%). The youngest students were evenly divided among diverger and assimilator while the oldest were most frequently represented as assimilators (67%). Finally, those with the least years of college tended to be divergers (55%) while those with the most years of colleges tended to be assimilators (58%).

The results did not lead to a statistically significant difference in learning style among any variables. Two failures of internal validity render these results inconclusive. First, the minimal response rate (80) was not met and therefore the results do not reflect a 95 percent level of confidence (Isaac, 1981, p. 193). Second, the distribution of nationality drastically violated the normal curve assumption underlying parametric technique and therefore computations for specific nationality were abandoned altogether.

The variation in learning styles did support Ewing & Yong's (1992) conclusion that cultural and ethnic groupings can represent a distinct learning style.

The variables of sex, age, and education followed the same conclusion made by Choi (1989), Titus, (1990), and Matthews, (1991).

## Conclusion

Some conclusions can be drawn but not with a conventional level of confidence. Seminary professors can possibly expect students in an Asian seminary to be most often divergers while students in an American seminary are more often assimilators. Professors in both locations can also expect some variation according to sex, age, and years in college.

## Implications

Asian students, as divergers, learn best from concrete situations with many different points of view. They like to observe rather than take action. They would enjoy brainstorming and gathering information. They probably have broad cultural interests, imaginative ability, and sensitivity. American students, as assimilators, would be more responsive to information put into concise, logical form. They would be less focused on people and more interested in abstract ideas and concepts. Logical soundness would be more important to them than practical value.

Other variables also require sensitivity to variations in learning style. Professors need to understand that variables such as those under study can affect one's preferred modality of learning. While professors do not need to formally assess the learning style of every student, they can vary their teaching style enough to embrace all of the potential types of learners in their class. They can also use

their understanding about learning styles to clearly communicate their content and expectations. Finally, they can challenge their students to try other styles of learning.

## Recommendations

It is highly recommended that this study be repeated with a larger sample of students and that matching be conducted for sex, age, years of college and nationality in order to fit the assumptions behind parametric technique.

If the exchange of professors is to continue, then the KLSI should be given every few years at both the American and Asian seminary. The results can be quickly tabulated and give very helpful information about the difference in American and Asian styles of learning. Trends in learning styles would also be forthcoming. The academic deans should arrange for the survey. The results and conclusions should be disseminated during a regularly or specially called in-service session for current and new professors. Most importantly, the meaning of the results should be discussed during this session in ways which will build confidence in effectively reaching the students.

Professors should no longer be placed before a strange student population without this process. If and when a predominate learning style is identified among a student population, the conclusions should be used in the interviewing process when a new professor is being considered for a position. If a professor is not adept at reaching a certain kind of student population, obviously this should be considered during the decision-making processes.

## REFERENCES

Ast, H. J. (1989). Learning styles: Implications for curriculum and instruction. Calgary, Alberta: (A paper presented at the Alberta Association for Adult Literacy Conference November 17-19). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 302280).

Bodi, S. (1990). Teaching effectiveness and bibliographic instruction: The relevance of learning styles. College And Research Libraries. 51, pp. 113-119.

Bonham, L. A. (1989, Fall). Using learning style information. New directions for continuing education. pp. 29-40.

Choi, J. M. (1989). Learning styles of academic librarians. College And Research Libraries. 50, 691-699.

Cordell, B. J. (1991). A study of learning styles and computer-assisted instruction. Computers And Education. 16 (2), 175-183.

DeBello, T. C. (1989). Comparison of eleven major learning styles models: Variables; appropriate populations; validity of instrumentation; and the research behind them. Orlando, FL: (A paper presented at the National Conference of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development March 10-13;) . (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 312093).

Dille, B. & Mezack, M. (1991). Identifying predictors of high risk among community college telecourse students. American Journal Of Distance Education. 5(1), 24-35.

Dunn, K. Dunn R. (1978). Teaching students through their individual learning styles: A practical approach. Reston, VA: [Publishing Company, Inc.]

Entwistle, Noel, Hanley, Maureen, & Hounsell. Identifying distinctive approaches to studying. Higher Education. 8(1), 365-380.

Ewing, N. J. (1992). A comparative study of the learning style preferences among gifted African-American, Mexican-American, and American-Born Chinese middle grade students. Roeper Review. 14(3), p. 120-123.

Fellenz, R. A. & Conti, G. J. (1989). Learning and reality: Reflections on trends in adult learning. (Information Series No. 336). Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315663).

Gregg, N. (1989). Learning-style inventory. In Conoley, J. C., Kramer J. J., & Murphy, L. (Eds.), The tenth mental measurements yearbook. Lincoln, NB: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements at the University of Nebraska.

Heitmeyer, J. R. & Thomas, H. B. (1990). Learning style dimensions in post secondary home economic students. Journal Of Studies In Technical Careers. 12(2), 139-52.

Hudak, M. A. & Anderson, D. E. (1990). Formal operations and learning style predict success in statistics and computer science courses. Teaching Psychology. 17(4), 231-234.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1981). Handbook in research and evaluation. (2ndddd edition). San Diego: EdiTS.

Karrer, U. (1988). Comparison of learning style inventories. [city unknown], Switzerland: [institution unreported]. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296716).

Katz, N. (1988). Individual learning style: Israeli norms and cross-cultural equivalence of Kolb's learning style inventory. Journal Of Cross-Cultural Psychology. 19(3), 361-379.

Kolb, D. & Smith, D. (1986). Learning-style inventory 1985 technical specifications. Boston: McBer & Co.

Matthews, D. B. (1992). Learning styles of education majors: Are they similar to those of other students?. STRATE Journal. 1(1), 28-32.

Matthews, D. B. (1991). "The effects of learning style on grades of first-year college students". Research In Higher Education. 32(3), 253-255.

Missouri University, Columbia College of Education (1986). Learning styles. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 323249).

Myers, I. B. (1962). Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Partridge, S. (1989). Consideration of adults' learning styles and life styles for better literacy programs: A discussion. [city unknown], NC: [institution unreported]. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304518).

Pun, A. (1990). Action learning for trainers' development: A design for postgraduate studies. Journal of European Industrial Training. 14(9), 17-23.

Reiff, J.C. (1992). Learning styles: What research says to the teacher. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Ross-Gordon, J. M., etal. (1990, Winter). Conclusion. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, pp. 101-107.

Rule, D. L. & Grippin, P. C. A critical comparison of learning style instruments frequently used with adult learners. (A paper presented at the annual conference of the eastern educational research association, Miami Beach, FL, Feb 24-27) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 305387).

Sangster, S. & Shulman, R. (1988). Impact of the 4MAT system as a curriculum delivery model. Willowdale, Ontario: North York Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 316567).

Sims, R. & Sims, S. J. (1991). Improving training in the public sector. Public Personnel Management. 20(1), 71-82.

Swish, K. (1991). American Indian/Alaskan Native Learning Styles: Research and Practice. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 335175).

Titus, T. G., etal. (1990). Adolescent learning styles. Journal Of Research And Development In Education. 23(3), 165-171.

# APPENDIXES

Appendix A

A Letter from Supervisor Authorizing the Study

EES
EURASIA EDUCATION SERVICES

DR. R. PAUL WOOD
EURASIA COORDINATOR OF MINISTERIAL EDUCATION
815 E. MCARTHUR DRIVE
SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI 65810
VOICE: (417) 887-8856
FAX: (417) 887-6794

April 2, 1993

Mr. Alan Algee
2116 S. Barcliff, Apt. A.
Springfield, MO 65804

Dear Alan:

Those of us working as educators in a cross-cultural context are well aware that the communication patterns and the learning styles vary significantly. At EurAsia Education Services, we have often discussed this. However, no study has been done to document and analyze any differences in learning styles represented in the areas of Western Europe, Eastern Europe, The Middle East, North Africa, and Southern Asia, areas served by EES. Since most of the EES personnel come from an American orientation, we need to be sensitized to the impact that diverse learning styles might have on our effectiveness.

I would like to request you to investigate this issue with a primary focus on a comparison between Asian and American seminary students. Two institutions which might provide an appropriate setting for the comparison are A.G.T.S. in Springfield and A.P.T.S. in Baguio, Philippines. The reason for suggesting A.P.T.S. is that its student body comes from various countries in Asia.

Since we work with 74 Ministerial Training programs and institutions in 70 different countries and republics, I am not asking you to cover all the variant cultures and potential differences in learning styles represented in EurAsia. However, if you can provide us with some data to support our generalized perceptions and help us to process the implications, we can begin to share this concern with seminary professors and missionaries who are involved with us in cross-cultural ministerial education.

Appendix B

Questionaire to Accompany the KLSI

**PLEASE INDICATE:**

1. **Your age:** _____
2. **Your sex:** _____
3. **Your Nationality:** _____
4. **Number of years in college:** _____

**If you want a detailed description of your learning style, then just supply your name.**

Appendix C

Cover Letter to the KLSI

EES

EURASIA EDUCATION SERVICES

ALAN ALGEE
EDUCATION CONSULTANT
515 E. MCARTHUR DRIVE
SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI 65810
VOICE: (417) 887-8856
FAX: (417) 887-6794

March 15, 1993

Assemblies of God Theological Seminary
1445 Boonville Avenue
Springfield, MO 65802

Asia Pacific Theological Seminary
General Delivery
Baguio City 2600
Philippines

Dear AGTS and APTS Student:

Learning styles have been studied by researchers, educators, and communicators from various perspectives. As an Assemblies of God missionary working in education and a student at Nova University, I am interested in the impact that learning styles might have on our effectiveness. Dr. Edgar Lee, Academic Dean of Assemblies of God Theological Seminary (AGTS) and Dr. John Carter, Academic Dean of Asia Pacific Theological Seminary (APTS) have agreed for me to research the comparison of learning styles of the students at these two institutions.

The enclosed instrument (Kolb's Learning Style Inventory) should take only about ten minutes to complete. Please check the items that apply to you. Many people find that Kolb's LSI provides interesting insights into their personal learning styles. Therefore, if you wish to have the instrument returned to you with an indication of your learning style, please place your name on the instrument. Otherwise, it is not necessary to indicate your name.

It is hoped that this information will be helpful to seminary professors, missionaries, and others involved in cross-cultural teaching. Thank you for taking the time to participate in this important study.

Sincerely,

Alan Algee

Alan Algee